REMARKS

STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 4, 7 and 8 have been amended. New claim 9 has been added. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5 and 7-9 are pending and under consideration.

No new matter is being presented, and approval of the amended claims is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

On pages 3-6, item 4, of the Action, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. On the continuation sheet of the Advisory Action, the Examiner states that the rejections of independent claims 1 and 4 are not withdrawn. Thus, the Applicant understands that the rejections of independent claims 7 and 8 have been withdrawn, in light of the entered claim amendments filed in the Amendment After Final Rejection.

Specifically, the Examiner states that the language of the claims raises a question as to whether the claims are directed to merely an abstract idea, since the claims recite a computer program that does not include the computer-readable medium needed to realize the functionality of the computer program.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's characterization of the claims. For example, independent claims 1 and 4 are directed to a Web server for transmitting a Web page. Therefore, it is clear that the computer program functions are embodied on a tangible medium (i.e., a Web server).

It is further submitted that the independent claims are not required to recite, "tangibly embodied" as the Examiner suggests in the Advisory Action. A Web server is a tangible device that inherently includes a computer-readable storage medium which is clearly a tangible device on which the program is embodied. MPEP § 2106 IV (B)(1) states, "[w]hen functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory...." Accordingly, the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101 are satisfied by the recitations of independent claims 1 and 4, as they stand.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of independent claims 1 and 4, as well as dependent claims 2 and 5, under 35 U.S.C. §101 are overcome and should be withdrawn.

6

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 1, 2 AND 8 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY BODIN ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,604,106 B1) IN VIEW OF LI ET AL. (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,591,266)

The rejections of claims 1, 2 and 8 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

The Examiner acknowledges that Bodin does not teach certain features of independent claim 1, and thus Li et al. (hereinafter "Li") is cited as disclosing these features. Specifically, the Examiner states that Li discloses a Web page generation portion, a Web page transmission portion, a content information extraction portion, a Web page regeneration portion and a regenerated Web page transmission portion, as recited in independent claim 1, for example.

Independent claim 1, for example, is amended herein to further clarify that the contents information process portion makes a storage portion store the entire or a part of contents of the Web page determined by the operation portion in accordance with the parameter designated by the user in connection with Web page identifying information for the Web page and user identifying information for the user. The contents information extraction portion extracts from the storage portion the entire or a part of contents corresponding to Web page identifying information and user identifying information both of which are designated by an administrator; and the Web page regeneration portion regenerates a Web page in accordance with the contents extracted by the contents information extraction portion.

For example, as described on page 9, lines 7-18, and page 10, lines 12-27, of the present specification, in the contents information process portion, only a part where display contents are changed, depending on the result of a process by business logic, is stored together with information identifying a Web page and information identifying a user. Thereby, according to embodiments of the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, a Web page that was sent to a specific user is easily reproduced. In addition, even if a current Web page partly or entirely differs from the Web page that was sent to a specific user, it is possible to truly reproduce the Web page as viewed by the specific user.

Li, on the other hand, discusses a system for updating Web pages stored in cache based on modifications to data stored in a database. When a user makes a request for a dynamically created Web page, the Web server 38 converts the request into a new request 46, including the URL and other parameters that can be understood by the application server 40. Then, the application server 40 puts together the dynamically created Web page 48 in HTML. (See Li, column 3, lines 37-49).

Therefore, Li fails to teach or suggest the features of independent claim 1 described

above. In fact, according to Li, a change of a "fixed part" of a Web page is reflected in each terminal in a broadcast manner. In other words, Li does not operate on the assumption that changes are different for each user.

Further, independent claim 1, for example, recites making a storage portion store contents information indicating contents of a Web page determined in accordance with parameters designated by a user, *in connection with* Web page identifying information for the Web page *and user identifying information for the user*. (Emphasis added). Independent claim 8 recites similar features.

The Examiner has not provided a reference that teaches or suggests these features.

Bodin et al. (hereinafter "Bodin") discloses merely a server-side mechanism that accepts a client request to serve contents, and returns a response. (Column 3, lines 54-57). The cited portion of Bodin merely discloses that the primary objective of Bodin is to optimize storage of the server contents, and dynamically serve such content in response to the client request. (Column 1, lines 64-66).

In fact, the Examiner notes, on pages 5-7 of the previous Office Action, mailed January 11, 2006, that Bodin fails to disclose determining the entire or part of contents of a Web page in accordance with a parameter designated by the user, or a Web page regeneration portion for generating a Web page designated by an administrator

Independent claim 8 recites similar features to those described above for independent claim 1. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the prior art fails to teach or suggest the features of independent claims 1 and 8 described above. Claim 2 depends from claim 1 and, thus, it is further submitted that claims 1 and 2 patentably distinguish over the prior art.

REJECTIONS OF CLAIMS 4, 5 AND 7 FOR OBVIOUSNESS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER BODIN IN VIEW OF CARLSON (U.S. PATENT NO. 6,697,849)

The rejections of claims 4, 5 and 7 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Independent claims 4 and 7 recite similar features to independent claim 1, described above. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 4 and 7 patentably distinguish over the cited art for at least the reasons provided above. Further, Carlson is merely cited as disclosing a business logic unit determining the entire or a part of contents of a Web page in accordance with a parameter designated by a user and, thus, does not cure the deficiencies of Bodin and Li.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 4 and 7 patentably distinguish over the prior art. Claim 5 depends from claim 4 and inherits the patentability thereof. Thus, it is further submitted that claim 5 patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

NEW INDEPENDENT CLAIM 9

New independent claim 9 recites storing contents information indicating the entire or a part of contents of the Web page determined in accordance with the parameter designated by the user in connection with Web page identifying information for the Web page and user identifying information for the user; extracting the entire or a part of contents corresponding to Web page identifying information and user identifying information both of which are designated by an administrator; and regenerating a Web page in accordance with the contents extracted by the extracting.

Therefore, for at least the reasons provided above for the other independent claims, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 9 also patentably distinguishes over the prior art.

CONCLUSION

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. Further, all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: _November 22, 2006_   By: _Michael P. Stanley_
                                   Michael P. Stanley
                                   Registration No. 58,523

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501